DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 289 221 EA 019 639

AUTHOR Thomas, Vernadine; Ogletree, Earl J.
TITLE Administrative Style and Leadership Effectiveness.
PUB DATE 86
NOTE 30p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Characteristics; *Administrator Evaluation; Administrator Role; Comparative Analysis; Elementary Secondary Education; Instructional Leadership; Leadership Qualities; *Leadership Styles; *Principals; Research Utilization; Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Attitudes; *Theory Practice Relationship; Trend Analysis

ABSTRACT

Trends over the past 25 years in research on evaluation of school administrative leadership are analyzed in this summary report. Administrator evaluation became a concern as the principal's influence on the performance and attitudes of faculty and staff was realized. Research on organizational psychology demonstrated the relationship between leadership effectiveness and subordinates' confidence. Recent research in school improvement stresses teacher attitudes toward the role of principal. Although surveys show that teachers and administrators believe they should make decisions about teaching and evaluation procedures together, findings also indicate teachers have a lack of knowledge about the issues involved in teacher evaluation. Early research on principals tended to focus on leadership traits, which were, for example, described as either "authoritarian" or "democratic" in nature. Henry Mintzberg's (1973) research established an undisputed administrative model based on the finding that leadership style had more influence on managers' work behavior than did situational variables. More recent research has investigated the relationship between the perceived leadership style of principals and the acceptance of teachers in professional matters. Attitude surveys attempt to balance the variables of a leader's personality characteristics, the type of situation, and subordinates' personality characteristics as determinants of the most effective leadership practices. Investigators can now state that leadership research cannot specify the proper practices for all situations. A 3-page bibliography is appended. (CJH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED289221

ADMINISTRATIVE STYLE AND LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS

Vernadine Thomas

Earl J. Ogletree

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Earl J. Ogletree

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA019639

1986

ADMINISTRATIVE STYLE AND LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS

Vernadine Thomas

Earl J. Ogletree

Throughout history good educational leadership had been the focus of intense interest, controversy and speculation. The success and failure of schools districts, and even broader aspects of society have been attributed to the skills, behaviors, characteristics and values of the teachers and educational leaders. The public concern for educational excellence and demand for accountability have spotlighted the quality of leadership in our nation's schools. Research has shown that administrative leadership is an important and often key factor in school's education effectiveness. Appropriate, fair procedures for assessing and improving the performance of school administrators are crucial to effective instructional programs. The focus in the past has tended to be on teacher evaluation. This trend has spread subtly over the past 25 years, markedly over the past five years to include concern for administrator evaluation (ERS Report, 1985). Due in part to the realization of the principal's importance in influencing the performance and attitudes of faculty and support of staff, formal evaluation procedures for administrators are now being advocated, implemented, researched and legislated.

Organizational psychology has devoted considerable attention to the study of influences of leader behavior upon evaluative reactions toward that leader, especially in such areas as leader legitimacy in the confidence and trust which subordinates feel in their leader (Kelman, 1970; Olsen 1968; Sells, 1968), and further that confidence in the leader is influenced by such aspects of his behavior as effectiveness (Gibb, 1969).

Gaynor (1975) contended that the purpose of evaluation is to help the principal to better understand the complexities of the school environment and to see his or her behavior in relation to that environment. He stressed that the main emphasis of evaluation should be to help the principal determine what changes need to be made in task priority and leadership style and to help him or her gain the knowledge and skills necessary to make these changes. Gaslin (1974) in describing a model used to evaluate the administrative team of the Marshall-University High School in Minneapolis, Minnesota suggested that the evaluation of any school principal or administrative team is of most value to those being evaluated when it is formative than summative in design. This premise, he stated ensures that the major goal of administrator evaluation is to improve performance in the variety of roles. Redferd (1980) agreed that the results of evaluation are most productive.

Buser and Banks (1984) found that support for peer or client-centered evaluation of principles was "minimal" among

administrators they surveyed. Questionnaires were sent to the elected heads of the state affiliates of the American Association of School Administrators, the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the National Association of Elementary School Principals and National Education Association. In answer to the question, "Who should evaluate the principal?", only 54 percent of all respondents were receptive to evaluation by other principals. When asked about client-centered evaluation of principals, 66 percent of the respondents favored evaluation by teachers. Not suprisingly, the teacher respondents favored evaluation of principals by teachers more strongly (87 percent) than did elementary principal (40 percent) or secondary (74 percent). Educators agreed that both administrators and teachers should participate in deciding what is important in teaching and in the total design of evaluation procedures. When teachers are involved, said Bolton (1973), they are more committed to the procedures, they know what they are to do, and they know what will be evaluated. Bolton further suggested that the design of an evaluation procedure should begin with a critique of how principals and supervisors are presently evaluating teachers. The insights gained by such introspection can serve as a basis for cooperation in developing a plan for teacher evaluation. Principals must continually ask themselves if their actions affect teachers positively or negatively. They must keep their own motivations and drives

under scrutiny (Redfern, 1980). Also, he felt that insight is an important ingredient in productive leadership and that principals have to accept themselves if they expect teachers to accept them. Again, he contended that principals, like all others, need a sense of personal security. The devastating effects of deep personal insecurities show up in leadership behavior, and they are very detrimental to good working relationships with teachers personal insecurity may manifest itself in punitive type actions, overdomination, self-justification, erratic behavior and various other forms of ineffective leadership action. He felt that the cure is to increase one's sense of personal security as principal's responsibilities become more complex and difficult, there is a tendency to become insensitive and arbitrary. A study by James and Jones (1974) indicated that individual variables such as job involvement may moderate relationships between such perceived stimulus characteristics as perceived leadership behavior even though such descriptions often tend to encompass an evaluative element and evaluative reactions such as confidence in the leader. He also contended that in spite of the indication that job involvement did not influence perceived leader behavior, it did seem to affect the relationship between leader behavior, confidence and trust.

The large-scale systematic study of school principals began with the National Principalship Study at Harvard University in

1959 (Blumbers and Greenfield, 1980). Prior research was limited to status surveys that chronicled various static dimensions of the principalship, characteristics of principals, their experience and preparation, working conditions and a host of other variables which could easily be quantified and collected by means of a mailed questionnaire.

Recent studies by the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education detailed the principal's role in facilitating school improvement (ERS report 1985). This included studies on principal's "Change Facilitating Style on the implementation of innovations at the classroom level. The traditional research and theory building around leadership styles, education administration, change and industrial psychology have suggested overall strategies and conceptual frameworks that could be used to analyze the role and activity of the principal. Supervision and evaluation of the teachers are an integral aspect of a principal's responsibilities. For many years, school principals have relied on ratings to help them make numerous personnel decisions on everything from granting tenure to dismissals. No doubt most principals believe their ratings of teachers are objective and are accurate assessments of performance. Teachers, on the other hand, are not so sanguine about the ratings they receive. They believe their performance ratings depend more on the idiosyncracies of the principal than on ~~their~~ their actual classroom performance (Bullock and Davis, 1985).

The work of House (1973) on school evaluation and Miner (1973) and others on personnel relations lend support to the teachers' point of view. It seems that errors in the evaluation process are attributable primarily to the values, prejudices, and sterotypes held by raters. Others studies (Golightly, et al, 1972) supported the view that people tend to behave more benevolently toward those to whom they are attracted than to whom they are not attracted. For example, decisions on granting loans, hiring, and even punishment for crimes were found to be influenced by the decisions maker's attraction to the target person.

Bullock and Davis (1985) studied the effect of attraction factors on ratings of teacher performance. Their study involved the pairing of principals and teachers on the basis of life style and interpersonal needs compatibility. A total of 39 elementary and high school principals and 290 teachers participated in the study. The principals had been assigned to their respective schools for three or more years and had supervised their teachers for two or more years. Three questionnaires used in the study were the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation Behavior Scale, the Life Style Orientation Questionnaire, and a teacher rating checklist devised for this study. Schutz (1967) designed the FIRO to measure the individuals orientation toward other individuals a characterized by two subscales. Friedlander (1973) developed

the LSOQ to measure the three contemporary life styles: formalistic, socioeccentric, and personalistic and the last of three instruments used in the study was a teacher rating checklist. It was hypothesized that principals' ratings of teacher performance were significantly related to principal-teacher life style and interpersonal needs compatibility. The findings suggested that school administrators were influenced by non-performance factors when they evaluate teacher performance. Attitude attraction and need compatibility attraction are influential factors, i.e., how well teachers relate to their administrators may be more significant then their performance in the classroom.

Utah and Florida teacher s attitudes toward evaluation practices had been investigated in a study by Kauchak, Peterson and Driscoll (1985). There were two data sources to investigate teacher s attitudes toward evaluation practices. The primary source was 60 teacher interviews conducted in the state of Utah. These included 17 males and 43 females; 37 elementary and 23 secondary; and 38 urban and 22 rural. The sample ranged in experience from first year teachers to teachers with 33 years of experience; the mean number of years of experience was 13.2, the median was 9. The interview consisted of 26 demographic and open-ended questions. The overall purpose of the interview was to assess the teachers' general orientations to teaching, their perceptions of presently occurring teacher evaluation practices.

The second source of data was a 23-item questionnaire administered to 168 teachers not in the interview sample. This sample consisted of 46 male and 122 female, and 94 elementary and 74 secondary teachers. All were from urban or suburban populations, and 93 of the teachers were from Utah and 75 from Florida. The mean and median number of years of teaching experience were 4.7 and 5.2 years respectively. Initial analysis showed no differences between the Utah and Florida groups so the data were subsequently pooled. The analysis of these data was focused on one of the methods of evaluating teachers. This study had begun with principal visits.

The findings on teacher attitudes toward teacher evaluation were lack of knowledge about the issues involved. The lack of knowledge about teacher evaluation practices were disturbing on two levels. If teachers were to become thoughtful consumers and participants in teacher evaluation practices, they must know which practices were valid and how to improve or remove those that were not. Osmond (1978) in his questionnaire had studied teachers attitudes found that 57% of the respondents said that not enough time was devoted to evaluation and recommended more and longer visits as desirable changes in the evaluation procedure. Rothberg and Buchanan (1981) surveyed 105 elementary and secondary teachers and found that brevity and infrequency were the second most mentioned negative aspect of evaluation

visits. These same teachers called for observations that were longer, more frequent and more informative.

Gross and Herriott (1965) studied the Executive Professional Leadership (EPL) of 175 elementary school principals in forty large school systems. They defined Executive Professional Leadership "as the effort of an executive of a professionally staffed organization to conform to a definition of his role that stresses his obligation to improve the quality of staff performance" (p. 8). This included the propositions that administrators of professionally staffed organizations internalize to some degree a staff leadership definition of their role during the period they formally prepare for it, and as administrators encounter certain obstacles it may make it difficult for them to conform the perceived definition of their role. They also investigated the influence of sex of the principal, amount of education training, salary level, school size, and number of administrative assistants leadership. They found:

1. A positive relationship was found between Executive Professional Leadership and Staff morale, the professional performance of teachers and pupils learning.

2. Principals participating in the evaluation of teachers applying to work in their schools demonstrated considerably higher EPL than those who did not.

3. Principals who had the greatest amount of formal education did not provide the greatest professsional leadership to their teachers.

4. Several conditions may stand in the way of a principal desiring to serve as the leader of his or her professional staff:

(a) His or her unwillingness to allow teachers to participate in decisions about central school issues;

(b) His or her stress on distinctions of status in terms in terms of his position in relation to teachers;

(c) The lack of managerial support teachers receive from principal; and

(d) The principal's failure to stand behind his or her her teachers when their authority over pupils is questioned.

Gross and Herriott (1965) concluded that for years principals have been exhorted by their state and nutritional associations and their superiors make the most of their position, but recently the role of principals has been challenged as unrealistic and inappropriate.

One major trend in early research focused upon isolating the physical, intellectual, or personality traits that distinguished a leader from his followers.

There are a number of studies to suggest that the behavior of its leader varies considerably depending upon the task at

hand. Carter and his associates (1950) studied the activities of leaders on three different tasks; reasoning, mechanical assembly, and group discussion. In the reasoning, tasks, the leaders more frequently asked for information or facts. When confronted with the mechanical assembly task, the leader most frequently expressed the need for action and worked actively with his men. Finally, in the group discussion situation, he was most likely to give information opinions.

The results of the Carter study were based upon data obtained with artificially created laborating groups. However, similar results have been reported from studies of real-life work groups. Stodgill (1951), in a study of leadership patterns of officers in 46 naval organizations, found that the relative emphasis placed upon particular leadership functions were highly influenced by the task situation.

Two classic studies are worthy of mention in this area. The first was White and Lippitt (1956) who investigated the effects of three different styles of leadership which these leadership these workers designated as "Democratic, Autocratic, and Laissez-Faire," on productivity and membership morale.

Democratic leaders generally tended to encourage their members to participate in the decision making, did not give rigid rules as to how things were to be done, and gave suggestions, information, and praise to the groups as a whole

rather than to individuals. Autocratic leaders, on the other hand, made all final decisions for the groups, told them how to do things, supervised members closely, and praised and punished individual members. The Laissez-Faire leaders gave no suggestions unless specifically requested to do so. They performed a minimum of leader functions and neither praised nor punished group members.

The results of this investigation showed clearly that the behavior of the group members differed markedly under patterns of leadership. The following was found in this study.

Democratic leadership resulted in greater productivity (measured by the amount of work done) than did Laissez-Faire leadership. On the other hand, Autocratic leadership led to greater productivity than did Democratic leadership. However, the quality of work was consistently better in the Democratic than Autocratic groups.

There are more direct and indirect discontent expressed in the Autocratic groups than in Democratic ones. When the Autocratic leaders were absent, their groups collapsed. In Democratic groups, there was only a slight drop in work involvement during "leader-out" periods.

Members of the Democratic groups expressed cohesiveness and satisfaction with their group experience than did either the Autocratic or Laissez-Faire group members. In this respect, the Autocratic groups were characterized by two patterns of member

behavior: either the greatest amount of hostility, aggressiveness, and scapegoating among members of the greatest apathy.

White and Lippitt (1956) stated that the findings reported in their study were based upon data gathered from youth groups, subsequent investigations with a variety of adult work groups yielded highly similar results. Taken together, these studies suggest that the "style" of the leader can have marked effects upon group performance (Baumgartel, 1957; Bovard, 1951; Hare, 1953; Preston & Heintz, 1949).

Grobman and Hines (1956) studied the correlation between principal and administration style. They surveyed eight principals as to how they functioned in eight-five different school situations. The responses were then reviewed by ten professors of administration from the University of Florida, who found that the most effective administrative behavior in each situation correlated highly with democratic style. They also found that although the principals behavior had a strong effect upon teacher, student, and community attitudes toward the school, it did not affect teacher and pupil relationships.

Researchers in the Improvement Process Program of the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education at the University of Texas, Austin studied nine elementary schools on three districts who implemented a curriculum change in the school (Stiegebauer, 1984). This Principal-Teacher Interaction

study investigated the daily intervention behaviors of principals over one school year. They found that principals exhibited three administrative styles--the responder, manager and initiator. The responder-principal style allows teachers and others to take the lead. They see their primary role as administrative, but they emphasize the personal side of interactions with teachers and the community. They tended to deal with decision making on moment-to-moment basis and to have short-term goals that change as situations in the school demand. On the other hand, manager-principals vary more in the interests of teachers, the school, and the district in their decisions. They are efficient administrators and see that basic jobs get done well. Yet, when a particular innovator is given priority, often by an outside force, they become very involved with their teachers in making it happen.

Initiator-principals sieze the lead and make things happen, occasionally at the expense and welfare of others. Decisions are made in relation to the goals of the school and in terms of what is best for students, teachers, and themselves. Responder-principals might take little action to involve themselves in the innovation, allowing the teachers to establish their own pace with it. A manager-principal might become more involved in the requirements of the innovation and work with teachers to understand and fulfill those requirements. The initiator-principal might establish a procedure for monitoring and

expressing his expectations for the innovation to teachers so they would be involved in the step-by-step progress of implementation and maintenance.

On the other hand, from his classic study of the work behavior of managers, Mintzberg (1973) established a administrative model that remains generally undisputed. He discovered that the work of managers is marked by variety, brevity and fragmentation. However, he acknowledged that his work did not consider the influence of personal style on work behavior. He studied the influence of style and situational variables on the work of nine school principals for one school year as they facilitated the implementation of a curriculum innovation in their school. Findings from this study revealed that style had more influence on manager work behavior than did situational variables. Three distinct styles were established and each of the nine principals was classified as having one of those styles. These styles were responder, manager and initiator. Initiators were very goal oriented and consistent in pursuit of those goals as a result their behavior tended to be related one to the other and to be focused toward accomplishing a particular goal. Thus, the work of initiator-principals did not seem to have the type of fragmentation that Mintzberg (1973) and others have identified in manager work behavior. Responder-principals, on the other hand, were not particular goal oriented. Instead, they viewed their teachers as autonomous

professionals and their role as one of providing support as teachers requested or need it. Behavioral of manager principals fell between those of initiators and responder. In this study, principals were selected as being representative of particular styles, and therefore the study included a range of behavioral patterns.

Getzels and Guba (1957) transactional leadership style recognizes the need to vary the emphasis on each of the other two styles depending on the situation. The transactional leadership style responds to the particular task situation. They contended that administration occurs in a hierarchy of subordinate-superordinate relationships. In the administrative process, roles which help to achieve goals within an institutional system are allocated and integrated. Getzels and Guba deduced three modes of leader behavior: 1) behavior concerned with roles, goals, and the "health" of the institutional system (nomothetic behavior); 2) behavior concerned with the personality, needs, and "dispositions" of individuals who are in the system (idiographic behavior); and 3) behavior which wisely combines the nomothetic with the idiographic (transactional behavior).

Mc Gregor (1966) implied that a leader's style is determined by whether one views those with whom he works according to theory X or theory Y. Theory X applied to education proposes the following:

1. The administration is responsible for organizing money, materials, equipment, and people toward the goals orientation of the organization.

2. Employees must be directed, motivated, and controlled. Their behavior must be modified by administration to fit the needs of the school system.

3. By nature, employees are passive, indifferent, and often resistant to the needs of the school system. Therefore, employees must be persuaded, rewarded, punished, and controlled by administration so that efforts are uniformly directed. This is all necessary because teachers, like all employees,

a. Lack ambition

b. Dislike responsibility

c. Prefer to be led

d Are self-centered

e. Prefer to remain in old ruts

f. Are gullible and less than bright

Theory Y applied to education proposed the following:

1. The administration is responsible for organizing money, materials, equipment, and people toward the goals orientation of the organization.

2. Employees are by nature self-motivated, have inherent potential for development and capacity for assuming responsibility, and are ready to direct their own goals toward those of the school system.

3. The essential task of the administration is to arrange for situations and methods of operations so that employees personal goals are most easily achieved when efforts are directed toward school system goals.

The conclusions indicate that Theory Y does not advocate laissez-faire management, the encouragement of mutiny, a soft human relations only approach, or any other aspects of nonleadership. An administration should not expect to accomplish a rapid transition from Theory X to Theory Y. Years of union versus administration entrenchment and a sense of rugged individualism ingrained in nonteam approach school systems prohibit such a transition. This is not to say that all U.S. schools are run by Theory X administrators; however, of those schools that have a Theory X approach, a Theory Y changeover surely is a tedious, although worth-while, project (Kaiser 1985).

On the other end of the spectrum, the leader leads by understanding perception of his own and others. He learns that everyone has perceptual screen through which he filters all sensory stimuli (Boles and Davenport, 1965). The concern of the Kunz and Hoy (1976) study was to investigate the relationship between the perceived leadership style of principals and the acceptance of teachers in professional matters. There seemed to to be reasonable empirical substantiation of the contention that subordinates professional acceptance is indeed related to the

perceived leader behavior of the principal. The finding that teachers with graduate degrees have a larger professional acceptance than teachers without advanced graduate degrees leads to speculation concerning the kind of impact the typical graduate program has upon teachers. Sherif, et al. (1967) have noted that as people work together over time their perceptions tend to become more alike. Leaders lead by learning the effects that individual's perceptual screens have on what they see as systems inputs, as the social exchange process, as system outputs, and as the communicators network.

Abby and Esposito (1985) studied the relationships between elementary teachers' reasons for compliance with their principal's request and the amount of social support teachers perceive they obtain from principals and fellow teachers in their individual school. The authors state that several implications can be drawn from the research findings. Clearly there appears to be a relationship between the system which principals utilize to solicit teacher compliance, and the degree of social support teachers perceive they receive. They state that teachers perceived significantly greater social support from their principals when they perceived that the major reason for compliance was either referent or expert power. Teachers perceived significantly less social support when they complied with their principal's requests for coercive reasons. Social support has also been identified as a factor in employee

perceptions of job satisfaction. Employees who perceived that they received adequate social support from superiors experience greater job satisfaction than those who thought they received inadequate support. It is plausible to say that there is a relationship between social support and job satisfaction, and that the job satisfaction of teachers may be related to the compliance systems used by principals as well as the amount of social support they felt they receive from their principals.

Members of the Rochester Teachers Association want to give their bosses a handbook on how to improve faculty morale-move prompted by a faculty survey rating 172 administrators Appelbaum (1985). The survey question asking whether the administrator "fosters high/faculty staff morale" receive the worst rating on the 21 questions.

A total of 26 percent of 2,000 teachers, aides and tutors gave their bosses a "poor" rating in that category, the equivalent to an "F" the rating scale was 3 for "very good," a 2 for "satisfactory," a 1 for "poor" and 0 for "don,t know,." The results were tabulated over the summer by a New York State United Teachers association computer in Albany. The survey question receiving the largest number of "very goods" 51 percent was "adheres to negotiated contracts." The survey showed 53 percent of the faculty rated their bosses as "very good" in that category and 29 percent chose a "satisfactory" rating.

Rochester City School District's principals and other school-based administrators received mixed grades from teachers and other members of members of the Rochester Teachers Association (NYSUT-AFT). The results of a survey administered to all RTA members were released today by the union representing nearly 3,000 teachers and other education workers in the Rochester public schools.

The first annual survey that was conducted in May, 1985, yielded 1,800 responses evaluating 172 Rochester City School District principals and other school-based administrators. Cumulative district-wide results are made public while the information on any individual administrator is held confidential and made available to that administrator upon request RTA (1985).

According to the district-wide survey data, 45% of respondents rated their administrators as "very good"; 41% said that the level of administrative performance is "satisfactory"; a grade of "poor" was assigned to City School District administrators by 14% of respondents to the RTA survey. Building level administrators received the highest grades for "ahering to negotiated contracts" and for "utilizing available financial resources to improve instruction." "The results of the survey provide very useful information." "We are now in a better position to know how the level of administrators should be commended for "treating faculty with dignity and as

professionals " (Urbanski, 1985). The survey also revealed lowest grades for fostering high faculty morale, instructional leadership and ability to benefit from constructive criticism. "They'll have to work to improving in these vital categories," Urbanski (1985).

The studies surveyed represent a fair sampling of more than two decades of leadership research. On the basis of these findings, some general conclusions can be drawn.

The available evidence seems to indicate that there are probably personality traits or characteristics that consistently distinguish the leaders from his followers. There is some evidence, however, to suggest that the leader probably cannot be markedly different from his subordinates if he is to be followed.

The results of a number of studies indicate that leadership do not occur in a vacuum but at a particular time and place and under a particular set of circumstances. Therefore, the situation determines to some degree the kinds of leadership skills and behavior that may be required. Some of these studies suggest that there is a tendency for democratic or participatory leadership behavior to be associated with performance that had increased worker morale. On the other, directive leadership has been found to lead to equally high performance but often results in low morale and commitment to work. However, the relationship between leadership styles and job performance is much too

complex to be explained simply by "democratic, authoritarian and transactional" leadership practices. Different leadership practices seem appropriate for different situations. Thus, under certain conditions, it seems a more directive leadership may be required. Again, the personality characteristics and expectations of subordinates will influence the kinds of leadership practices that are most effective. Viewed from a historical point of view, the studies considered indicate that behavioral scientists are making progress in understanding the phenomena of leadership. Research has come a long way from the early study of leadership traits, and investigators can now state with some certainty what they know and do not know. Leadership research can never specify the proper practices for all situations.

Bibliography

Agris, Chris. (1964). Integrating the individual and the organization. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Bavelas, A. (1969). Leadership: Man function in leadership. Selected Readings, ed. C. A. Gibb. New York: Penguin.

Bennis, W. G. and Slater, P. T. (1968). The temporary society. New York: Harper and Row.

Blumberg, A. (1980). Supervisions and teachers: A private cold war. California: Mc Cutchan.

Blumberg. A., and Greenfield, W. (1980). Perspectives on school leadership. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Boles, Harold W., and Davenport, James A. (1975). Introduction to educational Leadership. New York: Harper and Row.

Bolton, Dale L. (1973). Selection and evaluation of teachers. California: Mc Cutchan Publishing Corporation.

Fiedler, F. E. (1969). Leadership a new model. In C.A. Gibb Leadership. Maryland: Penguin.

Gibb, C. A. (1968). Leadership: Psychological aspects. In D. L. Sills International encyclopedia of the social sciences. New York: Macmillan.

Gibb, C. A. (1968). Leadership: Psychological aspects. In D. L. Sills International encyclopedia of the social sciences. New York: Macmillan.

Gibb, C. A. (1969). The handbook of social psychology. Mass: Addison-Wesley.

Ginzberg, E. (1966). "Leader and leadership." The development of human resources. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gross, N. and Herriott, R. E. (1976). Staff leadership in public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry. New York: Wiley.

Guba, E. and Bidwell, C. (1957). Administrative Relationships. The University of Chicago Press: Chicago.

Hersey, P. and Blanchard, K. H. (1969). "Life cycle theory of leadership." Training and Development Journal, New Jersey: Prentice; Hall.

Kaiser, Jeffrey S. (1985). The principalship. Illinois: Burgess.

Knezevich, Stephen J. (1975). Administration of public education. New York: Harper and Row.

Knickerbocker, I. (1969). Leadership: A conception and some implications in leadership. New York: Penguin.

Lippitt, R. and White, R. (1947). An experimental study of leadership and group life in T. M. Newcomb and E. L. Hartley. Reading and social psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

McGregor, Douglas. (1966). Leadership and motivation. Cambridge, Mass: M I T Press.

Mintzberg, Henry. (1973). The nature of managerial. New York: Harper and Row.

Moser, R. F. (1957). The leadership patterns of school superientendents and school principals. New York: Administrators Notebook.

Redfern, George B. (1980). Evaluating teachers and administrators: A performance objective approach. Colorado: Westview Press.

Schutz, W. FIRO. (1958). New York: Holt, Rinehart.

Sherif, M. (1967). Social interaction. Chicago: Aldine.

Weber, Max. (Ed.). (1947). The theory of social and economic organization, Illinois: Free Press and Falcon's Wins Press

Stogdill, R. M. (1958). "Leadership, membership and organization," The study of leadership. Illinois: Interstate Printers and Publishers.

Taylor, J. W. (1962). How to select and develop leaders. New York: Mc Graw Hill.

Tead, O. (1935). The art of leadership. New York: Mc-Graw Hill.

Tolstoy, Leo. (1969). War and peace. New York: Mc-Graw Hill.

Wood, Charles L. (1979) The secondary school principal manager and supervisory. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Abbey, D. E. and Eposito, James P. (1985). "Social support and principal leadership style: A means to reduce teacher stress." Education, 105, 327.

Bauser, Robert L. and Banks, Freddie A. (1984). "The way, what, how and by whom of evaluation principals, "NASSP Bulletin, 1, 68.

Bullock, William Jr., Davis, Joseph. (1985). "Interpersonal factors that influence principals' rating of teacher performance." Planning and Changing, 16, 3-11.

Carter, L. (1950). "The behavior of leaders and other members." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 65.

Friedlander, F.F. (1973). "Emergent and Contemporary Life styles: and intergenerational issue." Human Relations, 38, 329-347.

Golightly, C. (1972). "Like and Loaning," Journal of Applied Psychology, 56, 521-523.

Gaslin, William L. (1974). "Evaluation of administrative performance by a school teaching staff," NASSP Bulletin, 58, 72-73.

Getzels, J. & Guba, E. (1957). "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process," School Review, 34, p. 423-444.

Grobman, C. G. & Hines, V. A. (1956). "What makes a good principal?" NASSP Bulletin, 40, 5-16.

Jones, Allen P. & James, Lawrence R. (1974). "Organizational climate: A review of theory and research." Psychological Bulletin, 81, 1096-1112.

Kelman, H. C. (1970). "A social-psychological model of political legitimacy and its relevance to white and

black student protest movements." Journal of Applied Psychology, 33, 224-246.

Kunz, Daniel W. & Hoy, Wayne K. (1976). "Leadership style of principals and professional zone of acceptance of teachers." Educational Administration Quarterly, 12, 49-64.

Kauchak, D., Peterson, & Driscoll. (1985). "An interview study of teachers attitudes toward teacher evaluation practices." Journal of Research and Development in Education, 19, 32-37.

Rothberg, R. & Buchanan, L. (1981). "Teacher perceptions of teacher assessment." Phi Delta Kappan, 62, 67.

Stiegelbauer, Suzanne M. (1984). "How principals facilitate change in the schools." Education Digest, 50, 1-2,6.

Educational Research Service. Evaluating administrative performance. Arlington, Virginia. Educational Research Service, 1974 and 1975.

Osmond, P. "Teacher assessment of supervisory evaluations." Detroit: Wayne State University (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED200514).